MEETING SUMMARY

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN: UPDATE 2013
WATER QUALITY CAUCUS
AUGUST 24, 2011 9:00 A.M. – 12:10 P.M.
CALEPA, COASTAL HEARING ROOM
1001 I STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA BV

Table of Contents:

Welcome and Introductions 1
Overview of Water Quality in the Water Plan 2
Near Coastal Water Quality 4
Review Work Plan, Regional Reports and Charter 11
Updating Related Resource Management Strategies (RMS) 12
Attendance (34): 13

Action Items

- A critical scope issue is defining "near coastal" for the purposes of the Water Quality Caucus.
- Invite the Forest Service to participate in the Water Quality Caucus and near-coastal discussions.
- Work with Water Boards on generating a list of processes and efforts where there are opportunities for input from communities and the public.
- Provide link to Companion Plans document
- Look at opportunities for cross-caucus discussions at the annual Plenary session
- Provide information on Plenary dates and location
- Change schedule to say that draft Water Plan will be released in Winter 2012
- Invite participation for interests relating to disadvantaged communities, boating and waterways, USGS, UC Santa Cruz, Central Valley (Stockton) and Orange County interests, the Estuary Institute and USEPA (Carolyn Yale)
- Use an online survey to review the strategies and invite involvement from the caucus
- Consider adding surface water-groundwater interface as a sustainability indicator
- Clarify (or consolidate) the topics of sediment management and runoff management

Welcome and Introductions

Lisa Beutler, Executive Facilitator, reviewed the day's agenda which was significant in terms of emphasizing the focus of water quality in the Water Plan – as well as introducing the topic of near coastal. The Water Quality Caucus will be the first Update 2013 group to address this topic. The agenda also included work on the scope of work for water quality. Ms. Beutler remarked that the caucus will ultimately be comprised of approximately 30 members and it includes an impressive roster. Additional members may also be nominated.

Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR Chief of Integrated Water Management, welcomed caucus members and extended his appreciation for their involvement and participation, especially when considering the busy schedules of those present. He described the caucus as an important milestone in addressing water quality, noting that while this topic has been addressed in the last two cycles – the current effort provides the first in-depth discussions on the subject. This effort has received strong response and support from the water and planning communities. Mr. Guivetchi highlighted that the agenda includes an item on a robust and achievable workplan for this topic. With the inclusion of Near Coastal, Update 2013 will look at the entire cycles of water quality. Also related to water quality is the possibility of adding a new Resource Management Strategy (RMS) on sediment management.

Lisa Beutler then elaborated on the nature of the Water Quality Caucus, which is a membership group. As the group moves into decision-making, this will become important as the group works together as a deliberate body. Others who are interested in this topic are welcome to attend the meetings and provide input through the public comment process.

Introductions were then made around the room and with acknowledgment of webcast participants. Jose Alarcon, lead for the Water Quality Caucus, introduced the first agenda item which explains where water quality discussions were included in Update 2009. Mr. Alarcon also extended his appreciation to the caucus leads Karl Longley, John Ricker, Dan Yong and Tom Keegan, who helped develop the agenda for this first meeting.

Overview of Water Quality in the Water Plan

Lew Moeller, Project Manager for Update 2013, presented of overview of water quality in the Water Plan. During Update 2005 included water quality discussions, primarily in terms of how it impacted water supply and also as an element of integrated water management. This content was expanded in Update 2009, with input from the Water Boards and the Department of Public Health. Update 2009 also added salt and salinity management as an RMS. The objective for Update2013 is to further highlight the linkages between the 27 RMSs, which includes water quality aspects for all of the RMSs.

Karl Longley emphasize that the challenge is to find the links with those other water-related decisions: linkages between strategies and to identify additional strategies that may be missing. The participation by WB staff will assist close coordination with the recommendations and actions of the State and Regional Water Boards. This will result in a cohesive approach and discussion of water quality efforts throughout the State.

Mr. Moeller recapped where water quality discussions were included in Update 2013. This includes the companion plans identified in Chapter 3, which outlined the Water Boards' Strategic Plan and Water Quality Control Plans. It was noted that Update 2009 contained 6 RMS under the heading of Improving Water Quality and that 18 of the 27 RMS provide water quality benefits. Additional detail will be provided on these benefits in Update 2013. Also, the Regional Reports will be expanded in Update 2013 to better describe the how water quality strategies are being

used throughout the State. Additional topics will be included, such as floodwater quality and impacts to groundwater recharge.

Discussion

Comment: A number of factor impacts water quality, including activities on the land within the watershed. This should be addressed at an institutional level. Also, the definition of safe drinking water needs to be spelled out. Across the state, a substantial number of private and mutual water systems are failing and no longer meet state standards. Institutionally, often the State or local government agencies are asked to take over the water operations in those areas. In the past, that occurred by invoking public health concerns. That process is now complicated by SB x7-7, which sets water conservation objectives, since some of the failing water systems have system-wide losses of up to 80%. Taking over a system with that level of loss could impact the new agencies' ability to meet conservation requirements.

Response: Kamyar Guivetchi noted that these types of challenges can be identified and folded into the Finance Plan, which may also include recommendations on governance. This is important since no single agency can implement the Water Plan recommendations. Implementation will require close coordination with State and Federal agencies, in terms of connecting plans and aligning activities. The State Agency Steering Committee is sensitive to the frustrations associated with conflicting policies. The Finance Caucus will be looking at institutional tools include collaborative decision-making, litigation, legislation, regulations, permitting, and incentives. All of these tools can be used to incent behavior. Better coordination on the use of these tools is needed across various agencies. Challenges and opportunities will surface and inform the cross-cutting recommendations for Update 2013.

Response: Jose Alarcon flagged that the report on "Californians without Safe Drinking Water," found in Volume 4 of Update 2009, can be expanded to address the definition of safe drinking water and contribute to the discussion of consolidating and interconnecting smaller systems.

Question: The issue of failing water systems is an important one. There are likely thousands of small water companies that are not sustainable over the long-term. Will this be recognized in Update 2013? This needs to be surfaced and discussed at some time.

Kamyar: The Water Plan has to take this issue on, articulating the issue and using the Regional Forums have place-based conversations about this. The Forums provide the venue for regional outreach for water-related planning and management issues. The Regional Reports are a key item for the Forums, to identify and discuss local and regional issues and strategies. This issue is place-based and the deepest discussions will occur at the regional level. Those issues that span across multiple regions will surface and inform discussions on statewide policy. The IRWMs can work on the issue of water systems and the Water Plan can help with those conversations and perhaps crystallize some strategies. The Water Plan needs to identify where there may be opportunities for state government to advance that.

Lisa Beutler explained that each RMS begins with a brief description of the current state of the situation. This caucus may also be asked to help frame the right questions to ask around this issue, as well as identify who the questions should be posed to.

Question: Where is water quality for the environment and aquatic habitat being addressed?
Response: The RMS on ecosystem restoration addresses these areas of water quality considerations and could be developed further.
Comment: When looking at governance, much of the context on financing water has been at the local level. In framing the question, we need to recognize the ecology of water quality and that so much is occurring at the local level, with local governments and entities. That needs to be strongly recognized.
Response: It was noted that caucus membership includes strong representation of local interests, to keep the

Comment: When developing the Companion Plans, the Federal side must be involved along with Tribal lands (reservations, rancherias and allotment lands). Tribes are actively working with Indian Health Services and Rural Communities Association on water quality. When looking at regional governance, participation and the definition of water quality, regional meetings need to reach out to unincorporated areas and hear from rural, disadvantage and environmental communities.

Question: Are agricultural impacts to water quality being addressed? Also, how are alternative energy sources (solar and wind) impacting water quality and supply? Many of these are being located on ridges, and water sources are needed for construction and fire management.

Near Coastal Water Quality

A panel of several individuals working on near-coastal water quality was convened to highlight the diversity of near coastal water quality issues. The session started with introductions of the panel, with each member indicating their perspectives and involvement with near coastal issues:

- **John Ricker** works for Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Service, which s a local health deparment deals with many of these issues. The department oversees beach water quality, regulates small water systems and is actively involved in the county's stormwater program. Mr. Ricker also serves on the Board of Directors for the Resource Conservation District, which is involved in ag runoff issues and erosion on rural lands. He also serves on the Steering Committee for the IRWM and is involved in the Pajaro Watershed. John previously served on the Water Boards' Beach Water Quality Task Force.
- **Amber Mace** is the Executive Director of the California Ocean Protection Council. This Cabinet-level council was created in 2004, by the California Ocean Protection Act which was based on national recommendations to better coordinate actions regarding ocean coastal resource management and protection. Ms. Mace described the composition of the Council, which meets quarterly to work on high-level policy and vision for managing the

state's coastal resources. As a non-regulatory body, the Council recommends policies that may result in legislation and action by other agencies. The Council uses a science-based approach, supported by a science advisor and 24-member science advisory team. As a coordinating body, OPC works to bring agencies together on cross-cutting issues such as sea-level rise. The Council has received bond money which has helped fund projects including mapping of seafloor out to three miles. The Strategic Plan for OPC has five focal areas, including one on land-sea interactions and land-based impacts on ocean and coastal resources.

- **Dan Young**, one of the co-founders of the Surfrider Foundation, which represents all recreational users who have contact with the water. Policies that occur inland ultimately end up on our shore. Surfers and other recreational users are on the shore every day, sometimes a couple times a day. As a result, members are very concerned about runoff and pollution and their effects. Founded in 1984, Surfriders initially relied heavily on litigation as a tool to initiate change. For example, the organization teamed with EPA in winning a lawsuit regarding violations by a pulp mill in Humboldt County. Since that time the emphasis has been more on education and developing new models for helping to keep near-coastal waters clean. One of their programs focuses on keeping pollution and sedimentation out of coastal waters through Conservation, Permeability and Retention. Surfriders produced a 20-minute animated video that describes strategies for reducing coastal pollution. The video is available online at www.knowyourh2o.org.
- **Dominic Gregorio** is with the Ocean Unit, within the Division of Water Quality for the State Water Board. The Ocean Unit is involved with marine and saltwater standards and policies. For example, there is a statewide water quality control plan that regulates water pollution anywhere in ocean waters (the California Ocean Plan). The plan has the force of regulation, which is implemented through the permits issued by the State and Regional Water Boards in ocean waters. The Ocean Unit also worked on the once-through cooling policy that was adopted last year. That regulates intakes and discharges on coastal power plants, which use 16 million gallons of seawater intakes each day – a process that destroys plankton in the water.

Critical Water Issues

Panel members were asked to discuss a key water issue that they are currently addressing.

- John Ricker replied identified **stormwater quality**. Municipal agencies are now implementing stormwater management plans with the challenge of not having adequate resources. Stormwater quality certainly impacts the coast and could be a resource if captured through low-impact development or infiltration measures. Captured water could be used for groundwater recharge and reducing seawater intrusion. There are also questions and challenges associated with keeping stormwater clean and dealing with coastal soil that may have significant clay layers and not be especially permeable. It's an interesting issue in that it impacts beach water quality in the winter and summer and also has the potential to help with water supply.

- Amber Mace remarked that OPC tries to focus on issues that are not currently being addressed by agencies, or on situations where coordination could benefit the issue. One issue that the Council is involved with is **marine debris**. This is a cross-cutting issue for agencies and an important matter for the state, given the thriving coastal economy and the emphasis on clean beaches. This benefits the economy while supporting a healthy ecosystem as well. The Council has developed recommendations banning single-use plastic bags and other products that are ending up on beaches in high numbers. In working with other agencies the scope involves cleaning up what ends up on the beach and also preventing or minimizing the trash flow in the first place. This includes working with industry to reduce packaging and to improve producer responsibility for take back and recycling. There was an active steering committee that will ramp back up and look at all the recommendations, to prioritize and develop approach for tackling marine debris from multiple angles.
- Dan Young restated that **beach water quality** is tied to stormwater runoff. In Santa Cruz, during the winter, north swells tend to flush the system out. During the summer, many factors impair water quality: the ocean is more sedentary, there is runoff and leaking infrastructure from the City of Santa Cruz, as well as contributions from septic systems and marine life. Many times the beach is posted and yet people still go out. Surveys conducted by Santa Cruz indicate that the main reason come to the area is for the beach – people want water contact. Surfing is a $2.6 billion industry and companies are adamant about monitoring and providing cleaner water to provide the best environment possible.
- Dominic Gregorio remarked that the Water Boards are involved in the all of the issues identified by the other panel member. One effort that the Water Boards will be working on next year is an ocean plan amendment for a **salinity objective** and implementation for **brine discharges**. The effort also addresses potential intakes from desalination facilities. The package of amendments is based on a scientific approach. The three scientific efforts supporting the amendments include: a panel at Moss Landing Marine Labs regarding intake issues, another panel at the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project looking at brine disposal, and a research effort at Granta Canyon Laboratories (part of the UC System) focusing on the toxicity of brine.

Sediment management is another topic where OPC is supporting the work of a collaborative entity, especially regarding information on sediment processes and information that will reform regulatory processes to better manage sediment and make sediment available in the system. It was noted that the Water Boards are implementing sediment quality objectives. Sediment can be both beneficial and damaging; it is a complex issue. Sediment also transports a tremendous load of contaminants and pollutants. Sediment loads can trigger Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and affect surface water storage facilities. It was noted that, during the last few years, the Water Boards adopted sediment objectives for closed estuaries. Implementation of these objectives will help address transport of contaminants. There is currently a coastal sediment working group, being led by the Natural Resources Agency, Department of Conservation and Boating and Waterways.

Wastewater disposal was mentioned as another important water quality topic. Even with updated treatment plants, more work is needed for aging infrastructure and pump stations that might fail. Also, individual septic systems in rural areas are actually very effective in supporting recharge and reuse of water when properly designed, installed and operated.

Contaminants of emerging concern influences several different aspects related to water quality, such as water reuse and environmental impacts. There has been quite a bit of work with scientific panels and Liz Haven, with the Water Boards, has been involved with that. There is a mussel-sampling program that is looking at identifying which contaminants are present in coastal waters. The laboratories are currently submitting the final data for analysis.

Wetland restoration and wetland response to sea-level rise focuses a bit more on the land aspect. In addition to ecosystem benefits, wetlands provide flood management benefits and help reduce erosion. Increasingly, wetlands are being looked at by the IRWMPs. It's important to make that type of information available to local communities, so that they can identify assets for adapting to climate change and increasing the resiliency in systems.

Other high priorities for the Water Boards include a model-monitoring amendment and control of commercial vessel discharges, as well as the State Water Quality Protection Areas program. These are marine managed areas where waste discharge is prohibited and are also referred to as Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS). This year, special attention has been given to waste-loading from stormwater into ASBSs. This is associated with through-stormwater permits that the Water Boards are proposing. At a strategic level, the ASBSs protect Marine Protection Areas – from take and pollution.

There was a comment that tackling these, and other, coastal water quality issues will require an enormous amount of infrastructure that is needed along with research investments. Wetland restoration and sea-level rise. Flood mananagement and protection from erosion. Starting to work on that with IRWMs.

Water Quality Caucus Scope

Panel members were asked to think about the work of the water quality caucus and to identify what should perhaps be added to the scope to address near-coastal issues.

- Dominic Gregorio encouraged the caucus to think in terms of beneficial uses. Near coastal uses have two beneficial uses – human health (contact recreation and consumption of seafood) and marine life protection. That's how the Water Boards look at protecting near-coastal resources. An essential aspect is brine discharges and intakes. Brine discharges can result from water recycling, groundwater treatment, or ocean desalination. Ocean desal has the extra potential for substantial intakes. Thinking in terms of protection of human health, when looking at water reuse, it's important to reduce the contaminants in the water that will be reused. Brine disposal also brings in the issue of concentration of contaminants.

- Dan Young agreed with the points related to ocean desal. He also emphasized stormwater management using an approach of conservation, permeability and retention. This occurs at the watershed level down to the individual homeowner. A different approach is needed to replace the idea of moving stormwater out to sea as quickly as possible.
- Amber Mace also supported the topic of ocean desal as an appropriate issue for the Water Quality Caucus. This would provide an interesting opportunity for taking broader look at, including links to water supply in addition to potential contamination issues and ecosystem impacts from intakes. Are there options for a loading order, which emphasizes conservation and recycling and different ways of delivering water? This is an important group to be thinking about this issue.
- John Ricker discussed a larger framework of how to approach issues. There are many issues being addressed though a number of efforts – which may not be coordinated, consistent or complete. It's important to prioritize, local agencies can't do it all and it's particularly difficult to deal with conflicting direction from different state agencies. The caucus provides the opportunity to bring the different perspectives together and coordinate the priorities, while providing flexibility to local entities in terms of implementation. It would be good to package all of this into one set of recommendations.
- One other consideration is harmful algal blooms, especially sino-bacterial algal blooms (blue-green algae).

Questions of clarification:

Question: What is the *definition* of near-coastal? Is there a zone of influence? Does it extend to the coastal range?

Response: Different agencies use different agencies. For the Water Boards, the near coastal ocean extends from the mean high-tide line out to three nautical miles. Enclosed bays are also part of the marine ecosystem. The Coastal Regional Boards include watersheds that drain to the ocean. This is something that needs to be defined for the purposes of this group.

Response: For the OPC, the areas begin at the top of the watersheds and extend out to the 3-mile limit or even the 200-mile federal limit. It really depends on the issue.

Response: It depends on the source of the issue or contaminant of concern. In Santa Cruz, heavy metal loading is coming from SF Bay and the Central Valley.

Question: How are *Tribal perspectives* and issues being considered by the OPC? Would the OPC consider traditional science (ethnography and cultural value of the area)?

Response: The OPC has been engaging much more with Tribes recently. For incorporating traditional knowledge, much of the current science activities are focus on monitoring of the Marine Protected Areas (MPA). The MPA Monitoring Enterprise, is a program of the Ocean Science Trust. The effort is surfacing key data points that need to be collected for management purposes. The Trust has been going into the community and is very open to incorporating traditional knowledge into that process.

Comment: Overall, there is a history of the Marine Life Protection Act that excludes Tribes from harvesting in traditional areas along the Coast. There are some mitigation efforts regarding that –the current day realities for Tribes should be further discussed.

Comment: Saves the Waves designates historical surf sites as International Surfing Reserves. In Malibu, the Chumash were engaged in the process; in Santa Cruz, the Ohlone were involved throughout the process.
Question: Is temperature a component of water quality?
Response: Yes.

Discussion on Scope for Near Coastal

Comment: An idea that is intriguing is *multiple-objective management* versus a more regulatory approach. Sediment is a great example of a situation that is sometime beneficial, sometimes detrimental and needs to be managed. Water is the some way, where the Water Plan looks at management. The Water Plan is not prescriptive nor prohibitive. There is a concern about the potential for a regulatory approach to deal with desal and stormwater, which are resources that also present pollution issues. We all need to work out an approach of management for water quality that balances supply and quality.

Comment: Near-coastal Tribal communities rely on coastal resources for subsistence and cultural activities. How can communities with proportionally large consumption patterns and sensitive ages be factored into human health considerations for water quality?
Response: When the Water Boards set objectives for human health relating to consumption, that question always needs to be asked. The other agency that provides the expertise on consumption standards is the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. The Water Boards are also looking at human health effects in setting sediment objectives. Tribes and communities are encouraged to participate in those processes.

Question: Will greater attention be given to pharmaceuticals and hormones in contaminant discussions? The public is concerned about these issues and the topic doesn't seem to receive much attention.
Response: In terms of beneficial uses, there is a factor of direct effects of drinking water and indirect effects on fish populations (fish), and a third effect related to consumption of fish. There is a study on the effects of hormone disruption in Southern California, which may not be receiving much attention. Several panels are actively looking at this issue. A new panel has been established by the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP), which is organized through a joint-powers agreement for scientific research in Southern California. The bottom line is that these issues are being worked on, to try and develop better answers.

Comment: When looking at watershed management, as it relates to sediment management, many lands and watersheds are owned by the federal government. Discussions on upstream water need to include federal agencies. The enabling legislation that created the Forest Service lists favorable flows as the first beneficial purpose for the agency. Near-coastal efforts need to partner with national forests. Many forest supervisors want to be involved in IRWMs.
ACTION ITEM: Involve the Forest Service in the Water Quality Caucus.

Comment: Water quality efforts need to include more than laying burden on government agencies. To obtain the best results, non-government organizations and the public must be involved. Surfriders wants to be engaged in that level of outreach. For example, Surfriders established a program on ocean-friendly gardens that is directed at individual home owners. Another element that needs to be addressed is the water-energy nexus. Some effort is needed to reduce the embedded energy in water supplies. Solutions for addressing one problem may cause problems in other areas. As an example, ocean desal requires 40% more energy than importing water. Solutions need to reduce the energy that is embedded in water supplies.

Question: With the OPC mapping of the coast, is groundwater discharge being looked at as a component? Groundwater discharge impacts needs to be looked at regarding water quality and ecosystems.
Response: (bathomyths)
Comment: Looking at the greater hydrologic system and changes in the flow system, over the last 150 years, many basins are now disconnected. Groundwater connections to surface streams have been lost, impacting flows and recharge zones. Those benefits need to be kept in mind. When looking at environmental indicators, the surface water-groundwater interface should be included as a metric.

Comment: The Water Plan should list out those processes that communities and the public should be involved in. This includes efforts such as consumption standards and SCCWRP. Many are not aware of how they can participate.
ACTION ITEM: Work with Water Boards on generating a list of processes and efforts where there are opportunities for input from communities and the public.

Concluding Remarks

Kamyar Guivetchi observed that the dialogue resulted in a fantastic conversation on water quality. Including near-coastal helps provide a more complete picture of the hydrologic cycle. Not only are oceans a sink from the land, near coastal waters influence groundwater basins, estuaries and marine life. Recovery actions for salmonids affect water management throughout the state. Mr. Guivetchi encouraged caucus members to think about the different aspects of desal: both ocean and brackish. Another consideration is looking at integrated flood management in terms of the transport of water and sediment, both to and from the ocean.

Caucus members were reminded that the sustainability indicators workshop occurs later in the day. Near-coastal indicators should be looked at, in terms of better understanding how the water cycle is working. The discussions on whether to use a regulatory or planning approach illustrate that the set of institutional tools involves a wide-range of activities. The toolbox should be used in concert and synergistically towards a common end. Reaching agreement on the common end will inform the right mix of tools to achieve the desired outcome. This caucus creates a great venue for coordination, alignment and connecting the dots. The caucus can also increase

transparency by daylighting parallel activities and how they can work together in concert. Mr. Guivetchi extended his appreciation to the panel and caucus members for their contributions to the discussion on near-coastal.

Review Work Plan, Regional Reports and Charter

Jose Alarcon recapped the following items relating to the Water Quality Caucus:

- Objective: To highlight water quality challenges and to recommend strategies to safeguard public health, the environment and improve water supply reliability.
- Work Plan: Update water quality discussions in the Strategic Plan and California Water Today sections, the Resource Management Strategies and the Regional Reports. The Reference Guide reports will also be updated and expanded.
- Process: The Water Quality Work Team, comprised of staff, will develop content with input from the caucus. Additional perspectives will be obtained through the other Water Plan outreach and engagement efforts.
- Charter: Caucus members received a high-level review of the Group Charge, Parameters, Activities, and Scope.

Changes to Scope:

- Reword the sentence regarding no development of new data. Change to say that the caucus will be working from existing data.
- Add the role of coordination as a key activity for the caucus.
- Document is missing the mission and methodology
- Separate out DWR deliverables from caucus deliverables
- Clarify scope and expectations, "update *and develop as appropriate* water quality related portions of the Strategic Plan…" (add "and develop as appropriate") – this is on the second page
- In the box above that section, this group should be looking at the fact that local agencies are not going to want to take over failing public or mutual water systems (for public health purposes) if that compromises meeting SB x7-7 conservation objectives. This needs to be elevated to the State Agency Steering Committee
    - Add new scope item on coordination space, holistic approach, better processes
    - Look at idea of fragile issues in terms of regulatory-delivery systems, could expand the discussion
- Clarify new concepts (near coastal, sedimentation)
    - Overall runoff management approach (both urban and ag runoff)
- Wastewater disposal needs to be included, it's not just recycled water

- Consider how RMS link up with tasks – for example, that wastewater management addresses waste disposal
- Look at impacts of energy on water quality as it relates to various energy generation options; where does the CEQA water requirement fit here?
- On schedule, change the date for the draft Water Plan (it should say Winter 2012)

There will need to be joint meetings between the groundwater, energy and land groups. ACTION ITEM: Look to add time during the annual Plenary for cross-caucus discussions.

ACTION ITEM: Provide link to Companion Plans document. Expand on coordination between agencies for various water quality issues.

Lisa Beutler reviewed the Standing Charter Language, and asked members to review the document offline. There are co-leads for the caucus, who are assisting in planning the meetings. In terms of representation and expertise on the caucus, other interests that are being invited include disadvantaged communities, boating and waterways, wastewater, the Estuary Institute and USEPA (Carolyn Yale)

Updating Related Resource Management Strategies (RMS)

Megan Fidell explained that RMSs represent tools for managing water resources. These will be updated for 2013, including additional quantification and an initial discussion on how the strategies are linked. Some strategies will involve heavier revision, some will see lighter revision. New strategies that could be developed for Update 2013 include: Water Dependent Cultural Resources, Sediment Management, and Public Outreach. Water Quality Caucus members were invited to preview the working drafts near the end of the year. Members can contact Megan Fidell at mfidell@water.ca.gov or Hoa Ly at hly@water.cagov for additional information in terms of working on the RMSs.

ACTION ITEM: Use an online survey to review the strategies and invite involvement.

Comment: Water-Dependent Cultural Resources includes inland as well as coastal water resources.

Comment: Some water delivery systems are listed on the National Historic Register, and might be considered in terms of Water-Dependent Cultural Resources.

Lisa Beutler explained that the scope for this new RMS is being looked at and is not limited to one culture. There is a lot of historic infrastructure in California that has really defined the way that water is used.

Comment: The distinction between sediment management and runoff is not clear. Where possible, it would better to consolidate the strategies where possible.

Attendance (34):

Water Quality Caucus Members (24):

1. Donna Begay, Inter-Tribal Council
2. Dave Bolland, ACWA
3. James Cornelius, Sutter County RCD
4. Grant Davis, Sonoma County Water District
5. Ane Deister, Cardno Entrix
6. Anisa Divine, Imperial Irrigation District
7. Joe Geever, Surfrider Foundation
8. Dominic Gregorio, State Water Board
9. Carol Hall, Kleinfelder
10. Tom Keegan, Dry Creek Rancheria
11. David Kennedy, American Council of Engineering Companies
12. Alan Kurotori, Santa Clara Valley Water District
13. Karl Longley, California Water Institute
14. Chelsea Merrill, Professional Engineers in CA Government
15. John Mills, Tuolumne-Stanislaus IRWM
16. Terri Mitchell, SRCSD (Sac Sewer)
17. Tim Parker, Groundwater Resources Association
18. Cindy Paulson, CUWA
19. John Ricker, County of Santa Cruz Dept. of Environmental Health
20. Phil Rosentrater, Colorado River EDA – Salton Sea
21. Ron Sprague, CA County Planning Commissioners Assn.
22. Michael Urhammer, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
23. Dan Young, Surfrider Foundation
24. Cliff Raley, Table Mountain Rancheria

State Agency Steering Committee Members (4):

1. **Liz Haven**, State Water Board
2. **Amber Mace**¸Ocean Protection Council
3. **Darrin Polhemus**, State Water Board
4. **Al Schiff,** California Public Utilities Commission

DWR (6):

1. **Jose Alarcon,** DSIWM, Lead: Water Quality Caucus
2. **Emily Alejandrino**, DSIWM, Tribal Liaison, Lead: Water-Dependent Cultural Resources RMS
3. **Kamyar Guivetchi,** Chief, Division of Statewide Integrated Water Management (DSIWM)
4. **Paul Massera**, Update 2013 Program Manager
5. **Richard Mills**, DWR, Water Use Efficiency, Chief of Recycling and Water Desalination
6. **Lewis Moeller,** Update 2013 Project Manager

Facilitation Team: Lisa Beutler, MWH; Judie Talbot, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS